

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

AMAZON.COM, INC., et al.,

CASE NO. C23-1879JLR

Plaintiffs,

ORDER

V.

DOES 1-20, et al.,

Defendants.

Before the court is *pro se* Defendant Domantas Radeckas's motion to strike affidavits' opposition to his motion to set aside the default judgment entered against him on February 25, 2025.¹ (Mot. (Dkt. # 136); *see* Pls. Opp. Br. (Dkt. # 130); Radeckas's Answer (Dkt. # 126); Judgment (Dkt. # 128).) Mr. Radeckas asserts that his motion to strike the default judgment was actually a motion for reconsideration of the default

¹ The court considers Mr. Radeckas's motion before its noting date in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 1, which instructs courts to construe the Federal Rules "to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding[.]"

1 judgment order. (See Mot. at 1-2.) As a result, according to Mr. Radeckas, Plaintiffs'
 2 opposition brief violates Local Civil Rule 7(h)(3)'s prohibition against filing a response
 3 to a motion for reconsideration absent a court order. (See *id.* (citing Local Rules W.D.
 4 Wash. LCR 7(h)(3)).)

5 The court denies Mr. Radeckas's motion to strike. First, Mr. Radeckas
 6 characterized his motion to set aside the default judgment as a motion for relief from
 7 judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), rather than as a motion for
 8 reconsideration of a prior order. (See *generally* Mot. for Relief (Dkt. # 129)); *see* Local
 9 Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(2) ("A motion for reconsideration shall be plainly labeled as
 10 such."). Second, if the court were to construe Mr. Radeckas's motion to set aside the
 11 default judgment as a motion for reconsideration, it would summarily deny the motion as
 12 untimely. *See* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(2) ("A motion for reconsideration
 13 shall be plainly labeled as such."). Second, if the court w ("The motion shall be filed
 14 within fourteen days after the order to which it relates is filed."). The court presumes that
 15 Mr. Radeckas would rather have the court consider his motion to set aside the default
 16 judgment on its merits.

17 For the foregoing reasons, the court DENIES Mr. Radeckas's motion to strike
 18 Plaintiffs' opposition brief (Dkt. # 136).

19 Dated this 26th day of June, 2025.

20 
 21

22 JAMES L. ROBART
 United States District Judge